

**Remarks**

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Applicant acknowledges gratefully the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 2-6, and 8-11.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to better define the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable, as are the other rejected claims, 7 and 12.

Specifically, claim 1 recites an air supply module for use in supplying pressurized air for a vehicle air system. The module includes a reservoir having at least three chambers that are separated internally by a plurality of imperforate baffles. The chambers of the reservoir are sealed to store air in each chamber under a pressure of up to about 150 psi or more. The chambers of the reservoir are sealed from each other within the reservoir, and the reservoir is free of valves within the reservoir between the chambers. The module also includes a mounting system on the reservoir for installing and supporting the reservoir on the vehicle.

The structure defined by claim 1 is neither shown in nor suggested by the references. Marx is directed to a fuel tanker truck having separate chambers that can be, as desired, interconnected by opening valves. Although air will be in the chambers to the extent they are not filled with fuel, the chambers are not described as being sealed to store air under a pressure of up to at least 150 psi. (This pressure is suggested in Applicant's specification at Paragraph 39 as one exemplary operating pressure.) Also, the chambers of Marx are not sealed from each other within the reservoir, and are not free of valves between them; Marx includes a number of valves 15 for allowing fuel to flow between the chambers.


As a result, Marx does not meet all the terms of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is not anticipated by Marx, and applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

As to independent claim 7, Applicant respectfully submits that the Marx reference does not show a mounting assembly comprising a bracket having a support surface and a bracket liner received on the bracket between the support surface and the outer side surface of the reservoir, as is specified in claim 7. This understanding of Marx was confirmed in a brief telephone call with the Examiner on December 12, 2005. Therefore, claim 7 is submitted to be allowable, along with claim 12, which is dependent from claim 7.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12-14-2005

  
Paul E. Szabo, Reg. No. 30,429  
Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP  
Customer No. 24024  
Telephone: 216-622-8578